

two or more genera, or for genera other than *Eulecanium* or *Parthenolecanium* are omitted).

Genus implied	Name used	Number of papers				Total
		1960– 1965	1966– 1970	1971– 1975	1976– 1981	
<i>Parthenolecanium</i>	<i>Lecanium</i>	6	2	—	6	14
	<i>Eulecanium</i>	4	6	2	4	16
	<i>Parthenolecanium</i>	4	10	17	32	63
<i>Eulecanium</i>	<i>Lecanium</i>	6	—	1	2	9
	<i>Eulecanium</i>	1	7	1	13	22

These figures clearly demonstrate the prevailing and increasing usage of the names *Parthenolecanium* and *Eulecanium* over *Lecanium* in the applied literature in recent years. The same result is even more clearly demonstrable in the taxonomic and faunistic literature. This shows that the opinion of the majority of specialists in favour of the suppression of *Lecanium* is well grounded.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES FOR *PANOPEUS* H. MILNE EDWARDS, 1834. Z.N.(S.) 2236

(see vol. 36, pp. 158–160)

(1) By I.M. Kerzhner (Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences,
Leningrad, USSR)

Whatever H. Milne Edwards's intention may have been, his *Panopeus herbstii* should be treated as a new replacement name for *Cancer panope* Herbst, 1801. This follows from the citation of the latter name in synonymy without any such indication as 'partim' or 'auctorum' or 'sensu Say', and is partly supported by the dedication of the name to Herbst (not to Say) and by the text in Desmarest, 1852. The reason for the replacement was very probably, as in many other early zoological works, the similarity between the generic name *Panopeus* and the specific name *panope* (compare the replacement of *Scarabaeus melolontha* Linnaeus, 1758, by *Melolontha vulgaris* Fabricius, 1775, or of *Hemerobius fornicaleo* Linnaeus, 1758 by *Myrmeleon fornicarium* Linnaeus, 1767). Formal application of Article 72d to this case will certainly disturb stability of nomenclature. Therefore plenary powers should be used to give nomenclatural validity to the name *P. herbstii* in the sense determined by Holthuis's lectotype designation.

(2) reply by L.B. Holthuis

Article 72 says that only 'if an author proposes a new specific name expressly as a replacement name for a prior name' the types of the two nominal species must be the same. However, this is not what H. Milne Edwards did. He proposed a new name, *Panopeus herbstii*, and cited *Cancer panope* Herbst in the synonymy. Nowhere did he say that he proposed a new name *herbstii* expressly to replace the name *panope*. That he did on occasion expressly propose replacement names in this

work (*Hist. nat. Crustacés*) is shown in footnote (1) to page 377 of vol. 1, where under *Cancer limbatus* he cited as a synonym '*Xantho granulatus*. Ruppell. Crust. Pl. 5, fig. 3 (ce nom spécifique étant un double emploi, nous avons préféré celui sous lequel nous avons depuis longtemps désigné ce Crustacé dans la collection du Muséum)'.

I agree that *Panopeus herbstii* is a replacement name, but as it was not expressly proposed as such, it need not automatically be referred to the same type as *Cancer panope*. Therefore I was justified in selecting an American specimen to be the type of H. Milne Edwards's species.

I believe we have to interpret Article 72d very narrowly so as not to bind the hands of subsequent authors. That provision, by predetermining the type of a species that has expressly been given a new replacement name, also predetermines a taxonomic decision, and it should therefore not be applied more widely than is strictly necessary.

COMMENT ON PROPOSED NOMENCLATURAL VALIDATION OF
CAPSUS ATER JAKOVLEV, 1889 AND *LYGAEUS*
QUADRIPUNCTATUS FABRICIUS, 1794. Z.N.(S.) 2148

(see vol. 38, pp. 288–291)

(1) By L.B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie*,
Leiden, Netherlands)

Capsus ater Jakovlev, 1889

There is no doubt that *Deraeocoris limbicollis* Reuter, 1901, is the correct name for *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889. As according to Dr Kerzhner's paragraph 4 there is and was no uniformity in the use of a name for this species (both *ater* and *sibiricus* being used), why not follow the Code strictly and adopt the correct name? From the application I do not gain the impression that the species is either of great interest in applied science or otherwise very well known, so that a name change would not seriously upset current practice.

Lygaeus quadripunctatus Fabricius, 1794

In this case too there is no uniformity in the use of a specific name for the taxon involved. In recent years, judging by the proposal, three names have been used for the species: *quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794, *annulicornis* Sahlberg, 1898 and *annulatus* Carvalho, 1959. The first two are invalid junior homonyms and the third is a junior synonym.

The fact that both *limbicollis* Reuter (in *Deraeocoris*) and *confluens* Reuter (in *Adelphocoris*) have been or may be used for infrasubspecific forms does not matter at all, as both were proposed as subspecific names. The action of later authors does not affect their original status.

Any author who considered *Capsus ater* Jakovlev congeneric with *Cimex ater* Linnaeus would still have to reject Jakovlev's name, which could only be saved by the suppression of Linnaeus's name under the plenary powers.

(2) Reply by I.M. Kerzhner

Article 59b(i) of the Code protects current usage and permits the restoration under the plenary powers of 'historical' junior secondary homonyms replaced before 1961 if their replacement names are not used or only rarely used, or if the use